UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,891	08/05/2003	Diwakar R. Govindugari		1600

7590 11/07/2005

David O. McGoveran
6221A Graham Hill Rd., #8001
Felton, CA 95018

EXAMINER	
COUGHLAN, PETER D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2129	

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/635,891	GOVINDUGARI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter Coughlan	2129	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 August 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-41* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-41* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *05 August 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/5/2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Claims 1-41 are pending in this application.

35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 25, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the terms "user" and "human user" are considered to be a human being. Human beings are not considered to be statutory subject matter. A human being cannot produce a useful, concrete, tangible result. If "terms "user" and "human user" are referring to computer code then these claims are rejected as being an abstract idea not tied to the technological arts.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Georgalas in view of Cha, in view of Meltzer, in view of Holt, in view of Afeyan, in view of Altschuler, in view of Pham, in view of Lin, in view of Cheng, (U. S. Patent Publication 20030112232, referred to as **Georgalas**; U. S. Patent 6947923, referred to as **Cha**; U. S. Patent 6542912, referred to as **Meltzer**; U. S. Patent 6701305, referred to as **Holt**; U. S. Patent Publication 20030088458, referred to as **Afeyan**; U. S. Patent 6556983, referred to as **Altschuler**; U. S. Patent 5970482, referred to as **Pham**; U. S. Patent 6675159, referred to as **Lin**; U. S. Patent Publication 20040126840, referred to as **Cheng**).

Claim 1.

Georgalas teaches creating at least a first and a second semantic model wherein said first semantic model is restricted to a first category of knowledge and said second semantic model is restricted to a second category of knowledge (**Georgalas**, pp[0084] through pp[0087]; Examiner's Note (EN) When a first semantic model is created by applicant, this is equivalent to analyzing an object by Georgalas. The category of knowledge of applicant is equivalent to MOPClass of Georgalas. MOP stands for 'Model Of Primitives'. All one has to do is to analyze another object to create a second semantic model and have a restrictive category of knowledge associated to it.);

storing said semantic models (**Georgalas**, pp[0068]);

mapping the stored first semantic model to the stored second semantic model (**Georgalas**, pp[0090]:5-7; EN In this example, instead of 2 MOPClasses, one represents a State Class and the other as Collections), thereby creating a model mapping (**Georgalas**, pp[0090]:7-17);

storing said model mapping (**Georgalas**, pp[0154]:5-8);

accepting as input a first data associated with said first semantic model (**Georgalas**, pp[0035]:1-6);

transforming said first data, according to said model mapping (**Georgalas**, pp[0035]:6-9);

validating said first data according to a set of validation rules (**Georgalas**, pp[0078]);

and, forwarding said transformed and validated first data to at least a first software system (**Georgalas**, pp[0035]:11-13).

Claim 2.

Georgalas teaches step of mapping is further augmented with at least a third semantic model and said third semantic model is restricted to a third category of knowledge (**Georgalas**, pp[0089]:19-21).

Claim 3.

Georgalas teaches first and second categories of knowledge pertain to a common application domain (**Georgalas**, pp[0070]:1-5).

Claim 4.

Georgalas teaches the common application domain is further modeled by at least one topic semantic model (**Georgalas**, pp[0090]:7-17; EN The 'common application domain' of applicant is equivalent to 'attribute' of Georgalas. So when an object is analyzed in Georgalas, it falls into a MOPClass. Likewise in applicant's view, the 'common application domain' falls into a topic semantic model.).

Claim 5.

Georgalas teaches at least a first topic is associated with the common application domain and the said association is maintained in a template (**Georgalas**, pp[0094]; Georgalas illustrates a basic structure of the class MOPClass, which is equivalent to applicants template).

Claim 6.

Georgalas teaches the template incorporates a second topic, relationships among the first and second topics (**Georgalas**, pp[0099]; EN The Behaviour Class incorporates many primitives from the MOPClass, thus a relationship is established.), and at least one pre-defined rule(**Georgalas**, pp[0099] and [0100]; EN The behavior class has 2 arguments, one for input (argumentValues) and one for output (resultValues). Paragraph [0100] illustrates a Boolean rule).

Claim 7.

Georgalas does not teach a third semantic model is a referent semantic model. Cha teaches a third semantic model is a referent semantic model (Cha, C10;48-53). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas a

method, wherein said third semantic model is a referent semantic model by Cha. This allows the user to implement a linguistic expression for description of an object.

Claim 8.

Georgalas does not teach at least one of the semantic models describes the semantics of a message. Cha teaches at least one of the semantic models describes the semantics of a message (**Cha**, C4:65 to C5:5; EN Message of applicant is equivalent to sentence of Cha.). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas teaches a method, wherein at least one of the semantic models describes the semantics of a message by Cha. This allows the user to access the system using a natural language.

Claim 9.

Georgalas does not teach at least one of the semantic models describes the semantics of a Web Service. Cha teaches at least one of the semantic models describes the semantics of a Web Service (**Cha**, C2:49-53). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with a method, wherein at least one of the semantic models describes the semantics of a Web Service by Cha. This allows the user to use web type service for accessing the system.

Claim 10.

Georgalas and Cha do not teach at least one of the semantic models describes the semantics of a business document. Meltzer teaches at least one of the semantic models describes the semantics of a business document (**Meltzer**, C18:64-C19:1). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with a method, wherein at least one of the semantic models describes the semantics of a business document by Meltzer. This permits a user to communicate business information between applications and business entities.

Claim 11.

Georgalas teaches at least one of the semantic models describes the semantics of an XML document (**Georgalas**, pp[0046).

Claim 12.

Georgalas teaches at least one of the semantic models describes the semantics of a database (**Georgalas**, pp[0009]).

Claim 13.

Georgalas, Cha and Meltzer do not teach the step of creating the semantic models may be augmented at the discretion of a human user by importing a set of semantic information. Holt teaches the step of creating the semantic models may be augmented at the discretion of a human user by importing a set of semantic information (**Holt**, C9:20-27; EN Augmenting a model by applicant is equivalent to re-indexing by Holt.). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with a method, wherein the step of creating the semantic models may be augmented at the discretion of a human user by importing a set of semantic information by Holt. This will aid the process of creating transformations from a source to a destination.

Claim 14.

Georgalas teaches the set of semantic information is imported by means of a first adapter (Georgalas, pp[0067]; EN A 'first adapter' of applicant is equivalent to 'wrapper modules' of Georgalas. Both take in data from their respective descriptions and convert it to the common formats and/or representations and/or protocols).

Claim 15.

Georgalas and Cha do not teach the step of creating the semantic models includes user modification of at least one of the said semantic models. Meltzer teaches

the step of creating the semantic models includes user modification of at least one of the said semantic models (**Meltzer**, C8:1-14; EN Applicants creation of semantic models entails the modification of a semantic model is equivalent to Meltzer's modification of a semantic model to map between different data descriptions to create a trading community.). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with a method, wherein the step of creating the semantic models includes user modification of at least one of the said semantic models by Meltzer. This is helpful in making a smaller, less complex semantic model rather than a large and convoluted semantic model that handles many requirements.

Claim 16.

Georgalas teaches the step of creating the semantic models includes augmenting the semantic models indirectly with at least one validation rule (**Georgalas**, pp[0153]:15-29; EN Augment by applicant is equivalent to Georgalas customize the service's behaviour.).

Claim 17.

Georgalas and Cha do not teach the step of creating the semantic models includes augmenting the semantic models indirectly with at least one transformation rule. Meltzer teaches the step of creating the semantic models includes augmenting the

semantic models indirectly with at least one transformation rule (**Meltzer**, C23:3-10; EN Augmenting the semantic models with at least one transformation rule is equivalent to 'instructions in a custom programming language' by Meltzer. In this example augmentation, is equivalent to custom.). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with a method, wherein the step of creating the semantic models includes augmenting the semantic models indirectly with at least one transformation rule by Meltzer. This enables different types of media to make the transformation into a common area.

Claim 18.

Georgalas does not teach at least one of the semantic models is implemented as an ontology. Cha teaches at least one of the semantic models is implemented as an ontology (**Cha**, C1:49 to C2:3). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with a method, wherein at least one of the semantic models is implemented as an ontology by Cha. A advantage using the semantic models implemented as a ontology, is not only does it offer a collection of metadata about data elements but also a relationship among concepts.

Claim 19.

Georgalas teaches at least one of the semantic models is represented by a standard knowledge description and querying language (**Georgalas**, pp[0018]).

Claim 20.

Georgalas teaches the semantic information is processed according to at least a first rule in order to accomplish at least one of the operations of data profiling, semantic mapping, semantic resolution, data cleansing, normalization, transformation, and validation (**Georgalas**, pp[0035]).

Claim 21.

Georgalas teaches the step of mapping the stored first semantic model to the stored second semantic model further comprises: selecting and accessing said first semantic model based on association with a source (**Georgalas**, pp[0089]:26-29; EN MOPClassA and MOPClassB of Georgalas are equivalent to first and second semantic models of applicant. Georgalad discloses that MOPClassA instantiates MOPClassB, thus showing a association with a source.);

selecting and accessing said second semantic model based on association with a destination; presenting the semantic models to a user; eliciting selection of a first semantic element belonging to the first semantic model (**Georgalas**, pp[0071]:1-6; EN A interface enables the system to present semantic models to the user. When the user interacts with a given resource this is the first semantic model.);

eliciting selection of a second semantic element belonging to the second semantic model; establishing an association between the first semantic element and the second semantic element (**Georgalas**, pp[0072]:1-5; EN The method responds to the display of the contents, thus eliciting a response, and establishing an association.);

providing the option of using system help as needed; defining each relevant transformation rule(**Gerogalas**, pp[0153]:20-27; EN the use of pop up menus and editing abilitied of Georgalas, is equivalent to 'help system' of applicant.) ;

defining each relevant validation rule (**Georgalas**, pp[0153]:15-29; EN Augment by applicant is equivalent to Georgalas customize the service's behaviour);

providing the option of storing the resulting model mapping (**Georgalas**, pp[0079]; EN 'Edit' by applicant is equivalent to 'appropriate by Georgalas);

permitting editing of the association (**Georgalas**, pp[0153];20-27; EN By selecting one of three choices on each node of Georgalas, this defines the conditions and actions of the association of applicant by having the ability to edit these actions and conditions.);

and, storing the model mapping(**Georgalas**, pp[0079]).

Claim 22.

Georgalas teaches the step of providing the option of using system help is accomplished using an Interactive Guide (Georgalas, pp[0153];20-27; EN By selecting

one of three choices on each node of Georgalas, this defines the conditions and actions of the method. Thus providing an interactive guide of applicant).

Claim 23.

Georgalas teaches implementing by said Interactive Guide comprises the steps of: creating at least one candidate mapping between elements of said first semantic model and said second semantic model (**Georgalas**, pp[0037]);

Georgalas and Cha do not teach assigning a weight to each said candidate mapping, said weight derived from one or more portions that may be individually computed. Meltzer teaches assigning a weight to each said candidate mapping, said weight derived from one or more portions that may be individually computed (**Meltzer**, C3:13-23; EN Applicant's 'one or more portions' is equivalent to Meltzer' list of possible values.). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with assigning a weight to each said candidate mapping, said weight derived from one or more portions that may be individually computed by Meltzer. This provides a heuristic measure of similarity of the mapping in regards to the semantic models.

Georgalas, Cha and Meltzer do not teach evaluating each candidate mapping and eliminating any candidate mapping that is invalid. Holt teaches evaluating each candidate mapping and eliminating any candidate mapping that is invalid (**Holt**, C4:41-49; EN By using a threshold limit, this eliminates candidate mappings that are not valid.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with evaluating each candidate mapping and eliminating any candidate mapping that is invalid by Holt. This gives the user only mappings that are valid and not all results regardless of mapping results.

Georgalas Cha, Meltzer and Holt do not teach presenting a set of one or more candidate mappings to a human user. Afeyan teaches presenting a set of one or more candidate mappings to a human user (**Afeyan**, pp[0142]:17-25). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with presenting a set of one or more candidate mappings to a human user by Afenyan. This enables the user to see the final result of the mapping.

Georgalas, Cha, Meltzer, Holt and Afeyan do not teach eliciting from the user selection of at least one weighted candidate mapping in the set. Altschuler teaches eliciting from the user selection of at least one weighted candidate mapping in the set (**Altschuler**, C5:57 to C6:3). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with eliciting from the user selection of at least one weighted candidate mapping in the set by Altschuler. This allows relevant information to be passed on to the user.

Georgalas, Cha, Meltzer, Holt and Afeyan do not teach modifying the model mapping according to the user selection. Altschuler teaches modifying the model mapping according to the user selection (**Altschuler**, C5:57 to C6:3). It would have

been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with modifying the model mapping according to the user selection by Altschuler. This permits the user to alter the method making it easier for current requirements to be fulfilled.

Claim 24.

Georgalas and Cha do not teach the weight assigned to the candidate mapping is determined according to one or more heuristic rules, each of which determines a portion of said weight. Meltzer teaches the weight assigned to the candidate mapping is determined according to one or more heuristic rules, each of which determines a portion of said weight (**Meltzer**, C10:3-14; EN Each logical structure and definition of a document structure of Meltzer is equivalent to candidate mapping and the heuristic rules of applicant.). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas a method, wherein the weight assigned to the candidate mapping is determined according to one or more heuristic rules, each of which determines a portion of said weight by Meltzer. This allows one portion of a structure to have a higher priority over another.

Claim 28.

Georalas and Cha do not teach the system identifies those portions of the weight that cannot change on recalculation and does not recalculate them once they have been calculated. Meltzer teaches the system identifies those portions of the weight that cannot change on recalculation and does not recalculate them once they have been calculated (**Meltzer**, C14:8-17; EN Meltzer shows us a participant module which stores definitions which is equivalent to applicant's weights. These definitions remain constant unless updated by the user, thus exhibiting the fact the definitions remain constant. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with wherein the system identifies those portions of the weight that cannot change on recalculation and does not recalculate them once they have been calculated by Meltzer. This is a way to further achieve efficiency in the CoSim algorithm by not having to recalculate the weight values.

Claim 29.

Georgalas, Cha and Meltzer do not teach the inclusion of each candidate mapping in the set is decided based on the weight of that candidate mapping. Holt teaches the inclusion of each candidate mapping in the set is decided based on the weight of that candidate mapping (**Holt**, C4:18-22; EN Weight of applicant is equivalent to score by Holt. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with a method, wherein the inclusion of each candidate mapping in

the set is decided based on the weight of that candidate mapping by Holt. This is needed so the elements of a candidate are accounted for when generating a decision to include said candidate into a set or not.

Claim 30.

Georgalas, Cha and Meltzer do not teach the inclusion of each candidate mapping in the set is decided based on the weight of that candidate mapping exceeding a threshold. Holt teaches the inclusion of each candidate mapping in the set is decided based on the weight of that candidate mapping exceeding a threshold (**Holt**, C4:41-49). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with a method, wherein the inclusion of each candidate mapping in the set is decided based on the weight of that candidate mapping exceeding a threshold by Holt. This acts as a cut off point for potential candidates to associate with a given set.

Claim 31.

Georgalas, Cha, Meltzer, Holt, Afeyan and Altschuler do not teach the threshold may be modified by the user. Pham teaches the threshold may be modified by the user (**Pham**, C21:63 to C22:3). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with a method, wherein the threshold may be modified by

the user by Pham. This gives the user some control on what candidates belong to a set.

Claim 32.

Georgalas, Cha, Meltzer, Holt, Afeyan, Altschuler and Lin do not teach the number of candidate mappings included in the set is limited to a maximum number. Lin teaches the number of candidate mappings included in the set is limited to a maximum number (**Lin** C19:22-27). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with a method, wherein the number of candidate mappings included in the set is limited to a maximum number by Lin. This permits the user to view other documents that are closest matched by the mapping.

Claim 33.

Georgalas, Cha, Meltzer, Holt, Afeyan, Altschuler and Lin do not teach the maximum number may be modified by the user. Lin teaches the maximum number may be modified by the user (**Lin**, C19:22-27). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with a method, wherein the maximum number may be modified by the user by Lin. This prevents the user to getting overwhelmed by the number of mappings when a given amount would be adequate.

Claim 34.

Georgalas, Cha and Meltzer do not teach the user obtains an explanation of the weight of a selected candidate mapping was computed. Holt teaches teach the user obtains an explanation of the weight of a selected candidate mapping was computed (**Holt**, C14:17-27 and C19:33-35; EN C14 shows how the weights are generated and C19 shows that there exist an interface pertaining to operations of mapping). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with a method, wherein the user obtains an explanation of the weight of a selected candidate mapping was computed by Holt. This relays current information to the user how the weights are generated.

Claim 35.

Georgalas, Cha, Meltzer, Holt, Afeyan, Altschuler, Pham and Lin do not teach the user may modify any portion of the weight. Cheng teaches the user may modify any portion of the weight (**Cheng**, pp[0183]:1-8). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with a method, wherein the user may modify any portion of the weight by Cheng. This gives the user more control of the mapping process to the user if it is desired.

Claim 36.

Georgalas, Cha, Meltzer and Holt do not teach the user may modify the method by which the weight is derived. Afeyan teaches the user may modify the method by which the weight is derived (**Afeyan**, pp[0271]:1-3). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to a computer implemented method for integrating data of Georgalas with a method, wherein the user may modify the method by which the weight is derived by Afeyan. This embodiment allows the user to determine preferences of a particular mapping if required.

Claim 37.

Georgalas teaches the means of accepting data is via an Adapter (**Georgalas**, pp[0017]:1-4; EN Applicant uses a generic term 'adapter' for going both accepting and forwarding data. Georgalas uses 'wrapper specification language' for accepting data).

Claims 38 and 40.

Georgalas teaches the Adapter is a SOAP Message Handler (**Georgalas**, pp[0132]:1-5; EN Georgalas specifying the semantics being based on W3C is equivalent to applicant's SOAP message.

Claim 39.

Georgalas teaches the means of forwarding data is via an Adapter. (**Georgalas**, pp[0017]:4-5; EN Applicant uses a generic term 'adapter' for going both accepting and

forwarding data. Georgalas uses 'OEM' to transform results into appropriate objects for return).

Claim 41.

Georgalas teaches a general-purpose computer incorporating specific hardware and software for transforming, profiling, cleansing, normalizing, and validating data, wherein said specific hardware and software comprise: means for defining at least a first semantic model and a second semantic model (**Georgalas**, pp[0037]:1-8; EN applicants 'define semantic model' is equivalent to Georgalas 'defining a new resource'.);

means for defining a model mapping among semantic models (**Georgalas**, pp[0037]:8-12; EN By using the rule base associated with the semantic models, a new resource can be created.);

means for storing said semantic models and said model mapping (**Georgalas**, pp[0068] and pp[0079]);

means for defining validation rules(**Georgalas**, pp[0078]:1) and transformation rules (**Georgalas**, pp[0036]);

means for accepting data from at least one source (**Georgalas**, pp[0017]:1-4; EN Georgalas uses 'wrapper specification language' for accepting data);

means for transforming said data according to the model mapping (**Georgalas**, pp[0035]:6-9);

means for validating said data (Georgalas, pp[0078]); and,

means for forwarding said data to at least one destination (**Georgalas**, pp[0017]:4-5; Georgalas uses 'OEM' to transform results into appropriate objects for return).

Conclusion

The prior art of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

U. S. Patent 5983169

U. S. Patent 6434447

U. S. Patent 6957214

Claims 1-41 are rejected.

Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this information or related to the subject disclosure should be directed to the Examiner Peter Coughlan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-5990. The Examiner can be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:15 a.m. to 3:45 p.m.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor Anthony Knight can be reached at (571) 272-3687. Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks,

Washington, D. C. 20231;

Hand delivered to:

Receptionist,

Customer Service Window,

Randolph Building,

401 Dulany Street,

Alexandria, Virginia 22313,

(located on the first floor of the south side of the Randolph Building);

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for formal communications intended for entry.)

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have any questions on access to Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

Peter Coughlan

10/26/2005